Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Society.' These felicitous titles indicate the character of the sketches, which are based on personal experience and observations.

The present little volume forms a fitting addition to its publishers' previous trio of bird-books, namely, Torrey's 'Birds in the Bush,' and Burroughs's 'Wake Robin' and 'Birds and Poets,' either of which it easily rivals in interest and literary merit.—J. A. A.

The 'Water Birds of North America'—Explanations.—In the April number of 'The Auk,' III, p. 266, Mr. Ridgway has undertaken to "rectify" some of my corrections of the above work made in the January number (III. p. 124), and asks for certain explanations. It is unfortunate that remarks intended by me to be complimentary, and purely for the advancement of the science, should be so misconstrued as to lead to discourteous and almost personal criticism; but while disavowing the least intention to be unjust to the authors and compilers, I must insist on the right to give facts, even if contrary to their statements, and to let the public form their own opinions as to the points in dispute. Mr. Ridgway calls my article "a long list of so-called corrections." There are really less than thirty items given by me from the perusal of two quarto volumes of more than 700 pages, showing *prima facie* but little to correct. Many (14) of the items are typographical or proof-reader's errors, which need correction. Eight items are "additional observations," which I mention as such rather than corrections, although mostly called for by the omission of Dr. Brewer to quote them while compiling a work intended to comprise the whole history of the birds as then known. The corrections I make relating to the writings of others are all typographical, except those given below, and Dr. Brewer's omissions.

I now proceed to answer Mr. Ridgway's questions and "rectifications" of his own portion of the work, hoping to satisfy him and all others as to the facts.

Mareca americana. Widgeon.—The authority for the fact that the Widgeon does not breed in the United States is the history given in Vol. I, p. 522–524, where it is quoted as breeding abundantly in British America, "but only rarely in the extreme northern parts of the United States," without giving any instance of the last-named kind. Mr. Ridgway's specimens, though published eight years previously, are not referred to—a strange omission.

I must, however, confess here to a blunder of my own, which is, that I should have given *Æthyia americana*, the Red Head, as mentioned by Dr. Heermann, among the Ducks breeding in Sacramento Valley, California, not the Widgeon. No one else seems to have found it breeding south of Lat. 42°.

Pelecanus californicus *Ridgw.*—This being a little-known form I ventured to give some facts as to specimens I collected at San Diego, without any intention to "discredit" its distinctness as a *species*, but I will now assert that its claims to that distinction seem very slight. Its larger size is in accordance with the local variations of many other birds, and the